IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SIRI JAGAN

FRIDAY, THE 13TH APRIL 2007 / 23RD CHAITHRA 1929

WP(C).No. 13253 of 2007(C)

---

PETITIONERS:

---

1. K.V.SIVANANDAN, GOVT.CONTRACTOR,
   KURULI HOUSE, PONNOOKKARA (POST),
   THRISSUR.

2. T.A.HAMZA, GOVT.CONTRACTOR,
   THAMARAKULATHIL HOUSE, THOTTAPADI,
   MANNUTHY P.O., THRISSUR.

BY ADV. SRI.BABU JOSEPH KURUVATHAZHA
SRI.K.I.SAGEER

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. KERALA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY,
   REP. BY ITS REGISTRAR, OFFICE OF THE
   KERALA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY,
   VELLANIKKARA, MANNUTHY, THRISSUR.

2. THE REGISTRAR,
   KERALA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY,
   VELLANIKKARA, MANNUTHY, THRISSUR.

3. THE VICE CHANCELLOR,
   KERALA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY,
   VALLANIKKARA, MANNUTHY, THRISSUR.

4. THE DIRECTOR OF PHYSICAL PLANT,
   DIRECTORATE OF PHYSICAL PLANT,
   MAIN CAMPUS, VELLANIKKARA, MANNUTHY,
   THRISSUR.

BY SRI. RENJITH THAMPAN - SC

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 13/04/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

**S. SIRI JAGAN, J.**

**----------**

**W.P.(C)NO.13253 OF 2007**

**----------**

**DATED THIS THE 13th DAY OF APRIL, 2007**

**JUDGMENT**

The petitioners seek the following reliefs in this writ petition.

> "i) issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order of direction commanding the respondents not to allot any work to any contractor, in violation of the provisions of Kerala Public Works Department Manual, without inviting tenders;
>
> ii) issue a writ of prohibition or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, restraining the University from distribution of its largesse, without inviting tenders and picking and choosing the contractors, in violation of Article 14 of the Constitution of India;
>
> (iii) issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction commanding the respondents 2 to 4 to consider and dispose of Ext.P4 representation.
>
> (iv) issue any such other writ, order or direction which may deem fit in the facts and circumstances of the case."

2. However, the petitioners do not say anywhere in the writ petition as to which work to be awarded by the respondents is the subject matter of this writ petition. In the above circumstances, I am not inclined to pass such general orders as prayed for by the petitioners.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. Of course, it would be open to the petitioners, if law permits, to challenge the action of the respondents in respect of individual works.

**S. SIRI JAGAN, JUDGE**

Acd